STATESMANSHIP AND RELIGION

HENRY A. WALLACE

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
APR 30 1969
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BR 115 .S6 W27
Wallace, Henry Agard, 1888-
1965.
Statesmanship and religion

STATESMANSHIP and RELIGION

THE GREAT SEAL OF THE UNITED STATES: REVERSE SIDE

APR 30

STATESMANSHIP AND RELIGION

By

HENRY A. WALLACE

Secretary of Agriculture of the United States

ROUND TABLE PRESS, INC.

NEW YORK 1934

COPYRIGHT, 1934, BY ROUND TABLE PRESS, INC.
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY
SELECT PRINTING COMPANY, INC., NEW YORK, N. Y.

PREFACE

For the past few years we have been going through an economic and social crisis probably as severe as any that our civilization has ever had to face. It has come as a result, in large part, of our failure to learn how to live with abundance. We have conquered great physical obstacles and have taken possession of vast natural resources; we have the man-power, the machine-power, and the technique to convert these resources into a much higher standard of living; yet here we are bogged down for lack of a social machine that will help us distribute, fairly, the fruits of our labor.

The spirit which we employed and which we extolled throughout the expansionist era

in our history was the spirit of the pioneer. A proud and rugged individualism carved a nation out of the wilderness. Probably no other spirit would have been so well adapted to the rapid growth of a new nation on a new continent.

Our pioneer forefathers, confronting physical hazards and obstacles which do not exist for us, had need of all the physical and moral stamina they could summon. It is not surprising that they turned so much to the Psalms of David for spiritual meat and drink. The Psalms seemed to typify the rugged individual, fearless, prepared to meet his God face to face.

The pioneers lived in a scarcity economy. The first obligation was to produce enough of the necessaries of life to go around. It meant hard work, discouraging work, often disagreeable and unpleasant work. But because it had to be done, because starvation and

deprivation might result if it were not done, men made a virtue of work. If the task was monotonous, the more reason for spurring on the worker with the message that work was a virtue; leisure, anti-social. Likewise, it became always right to save, rarely right to spend. The harder a man worked, and the more he saved, the finer citizen he was rated.

Now I do not speak of this pioneer age and these pioneer virtues disparagingly. But I make a distinction between the pioneer era and our era; and I make a distinction between the attitudes that properly dominate one era, and the attitudes that ought properly to dominate another.

For now, the fifth or sixth generation beyond those old pioneers, we have come to a time of abundance, instead of penury. But, because we have not learned how to live with abundance, men go hungry and ragged. Because our great business institutions saved too

strenuously in the fat years, and accumulated huge corporate surpluses at the cost of their workers' purchasing power, demand lagged far behind supply, depression came, and men lost their jobs.

Is our spiritual life today awake to the need for social justice, and have we souls rich enough to endure abundance? I do not know. That is the challenge of the Church today.

It is the job of government, as I see it, to devise and develop the social machinery which will work out the implications of the social message of the old prophets and of the Sermon on the Mount; but it remains the opportunity of the Church to fill men's hearts and minds with the spirit and the meaning of those great visions. They have meaning today to an amazing degree, if only we will look about us with eyes clear of prejudice and greed.

I especially hope that many young people

from twenty to thirty years of age will read this little book. They have been terribly disillusioned by the depression and are searching for firm foundations. No one can solve the problem completely for them but I am certain that they will find help in spending a little time reading about the vigorous flesh-and-blood men of former ages who strove to find the roots of their depressions in human hearts, the social machinery of the day, the attitude toward God and the relationship between nation and nation.

We are going through today, on a world-wide scale, a situation which many times before has affected smaller segments of the world. The development of the ideas which guide large groups of men is one of the most tremendously fascinating things in the world. I am inclined to think that the trials and tribulations which we are now undergoing will result sometime during the next thirty

years in a movement as profoundly significant for future history as the movements described in the first two chapters of this book. The younger people especially are a living part of this drama. They will have the opportunity eventually of entering into the Promised Land. We older people, conditioned by the prejudices growing out of our past, resemble all too closely the Children of Israel who as superstitious, quarrelsome slaves left the flesh-pots of Egypt on the way toward a brighter future.

While I have been thinking along the lines suggested here for a good many years, the immediate occasion for putting down my ideas came when President Albert W. Palmer kindly invited me to deliver the Alden-Tuthill Lectures before the Chicago Theological Seminary this year. These lectures form the substance of the first three chapters of this book. The fourth chapter

is the substance of a talk given before the Federal Council of Churches in December, 1933.

HENRY A. WALLACE.

Washington, D. C.
March, 1934.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
PREFACE	5
I. THE SPIRITUAL ADVENTURE OF THE PROPHETS	15
II. THE SPIRITUAL ADVENTURE OF THE REFORMERS	39
III. THE GREAT SPIRITUAL ADVENTURE OF OUR AGE	73
IV. STATESMANSHIP AND RELIGION .	113

I

THE SPIRITUAL ADVENTURE OF THE PROPHETS

I

THE SPIRITUAL ADVENTURE OF THE PROPHETS

THE most fascinating thing in all history is the endeavor to discern the metaphysical, the psychological, the spiritual roots of those great movements in human behavior which take centuries to work out in the form of government, methods of transportation, music, literature and all the varied panoply of that which we call civilization.

What we are today traces to an extraordinary degree to certain great spiritual adventures, among which I would list prominently the adventure of the Hebrew prophets and

the adventure of the great Reformationists like Luther and Calvin.

The prophets were the first people in recorded history to cry out in a loud clear voice concerning the problems of human justice. The social conflict of the day was strangely modern in many ways. The wandering tribes of Israel had come into the Promised Land and, while they killed off many of the Canaanites, a great many of them were undoubtedly left living.

This puts in contrast two civilizations; differences within each one have been familiar, and more or less taken for granted, but because of the new contrast are themselves sharpened. And so we have one of those situations where for centuries there is a conflict of views as to what is the right, just and proper method of living. Such a conflict, while it leads to great unrest, may also be very fruitful at times. We know how the Nor-

mans, settling among the Saxons, eventually produced the Magna Carta and the parliamentary form of government. And so we have the shepherd tribes of Israel settling down among a Canaanite population, accustomed to a monetary civilization. The Canaanites were much more familiar than the Israelites with the ownership of land, the giving of mortgages, the taking of interest, the foreclosure of mortgages and the loss of property and even of freedom. All of these things seemed right and proper in a settled commercial civilization, but they never seemed right to those who had in their immediate background the traditions of wandering tribesmen.

The military genius of David for a time welded together these diverse elements in a superficial form. It will be remembered that David started out by gathering around him 400 men of the discontented debtor class.

After David became firmly seated, he forgot more and more about the downtrodden debtor class. Or perhaps the problem was such that no administrator could have handled it anyway. Absalom, seeing the discontent, led a revolt which David was able to put down because of superior military force. The same thing happened again after David died. Solomon with the support of the urban commercial element was able to triumph over Adonijah representing those who were discontented with what had become an urbanized administration. During Solomon's time, commerce expanded enormously. It was a period of great public works. Taxes increased, but not to an unbearable point until after Solomon died.

The binding together of the city and country populations, of the worshipers of Baal and of Jehovah under David and Solomon was a temporary thing made possible only by

the striking personalities of an exceptional warrior and an unusual builder and wise man. It costs money to maintain armed forces and to construct great buildings. Increased commerce is often at the expense of the country people, and a resplendent court is not always a joy to the farmer. Samuel foresaw all this if we are to believe the eighth chapter of I Samuel in which he predicts that kings would bring slavery and taxes and war.

The battle which had been brewing for more than fifty years broke out the moment Solomon died. The tax-burdened people no longer had their imagination fired by a great and wise man. They saw the taxes instead of the temple, and when Rehoboam was unable to furnish them either with a program of reduced taxes or commercial expansion, the break-up was inevitable. The richer country to the north, which had been paying more than its share of taxes and receiving

less than its share of glory, withdrew. And now in both kingdoms, but especially in the richer land of Israel, began that striking conflict between Baal and Jehovah, between the commercial point of view and the old-fashioned hillman's attitude, and between the kept priestly prophets attached to the courts and those lion-hearted, independent prophets who first of all historic men on this earth denounced the way in which a commercial civilization so often enables the rich to get richer at the expense of the poor.

It happens, fortunately it seems to me, that the Biblical record is heavily loaded on the side of the Progressive Independents. The fight conducted against the standpatters worshiping Baal and running their commercial affairs according to ancient respectable Canaanitish traditions in its inward essence is as strikingly modern as that between the Sons of the Wild Jackass and Wall Street.

Of course today most people thoughtlessly look on such vigorous prophets as Elijah, Amos, Micah and Jeremiah as respectable old grandfathers with long white beards. As a matter of fact, they were as vivid as Senator Norris and at the time they made their pronouncements were as unpopular as the Senator in the Coolidge administration.

II

The independent prophets and Jehovah, their God, never did come out definitely on top until they had been made into appropriate dry dust by the passage of time. I am sure if we had been trying to earn a living in one of the walled cities of Judah six hundred twenty years before Christ, most of us would have been respectable worshipers of Baal genuinely worried about the subversive tendencies of that fellow Jeremiah who was breaking down confidence and saying things

that were bad for business. On the other hand, if in the time of Amos we had been watching sheep in the hill country of Gilead or Judah, most of us would have said, paraphrased into modern vernacular, "Old Amos is sure telling those crooked priests and business men where to get off. If he keeps it up he will stop foreclosures and maybe get us an honest dollar that will remain stable in purchasing power from one generation to the next."

Of course, Bible English renders Amos's thoughts in the following words: "Hear this, O ye that swallow up the needy, even to make the poor of the land to fail, saying when will the new moon be gone that we may sell corn and the Sabbath, that we may set forth wheat, making the ephah small, and the shekel great, and falsifying the balances by deceit? That we may buy the poor for silver, and the needy for a pair of shoes; yea and sell the refuse

of the wheat. . . . Shall not the land tremble for this? I will send a famine in the land, not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the words of the Lord."

Amos was neither an economist nor a politician. He knew nothing of pure food laws or commodity exchange regulation or modern monetary systems. He was a typical farmer disgusted with a commercial civilization that by deceit robbed farmers of their land and freedom. Perhaps there was depression abroad in the land when Amos left his sheep behind him in the hills of Judea to go to Bethel, a leading city and sanctuary of Israel. The first great reformer of history, he strode into Bethel strong in the insight which had come to him as he thought of the wrongs of that day. He gathered his crowd by telling of the disaster which would come to neighboring nations because of their misdeeds. But

when he told of the similar misdeeds of Israel and similar disaster, it was more than the professional prophet Amaziah could stand.

Amaziah immediately complained to King Jeroboam with the age-old plaint of respectable men rudely disturbed by a reformer; said Amaziah concerning Amos, "The land is not able to bear all his words." He assumed Amos was one of the kept prophets of Judah and suggested that he go back home and prophesy there in return for the bread of his own land. Most prophets have been true to their bread, but you can't tell how they will act in a strange land.

It happened Amaziah was wrong and Amos in his wrath denied as though it were an insult that he was a prophet or a son of a prophet. He was simply a farmer and the Lord had come to him as he followed his flock. With wrath redoubled he returned to his task of prophesying disaster for misdeeds

committed. Amos, an enraged farmer, seeing the havoc wrought by a commercial civilization, gave expression to the oldest passages of the Bible. It was after Amos that Deuteronomy, Judges, Kings and the rest of the Bible was written. Undoubtedly this indignant farmer, who disdained to be called a prophet but nevertheless felt so deeply that he spoke in the name of the Lord, has had through the ages an extraordinary influence on the fight for social justice.

Micah, another farmer, prophesied shortly after Amos in much the same terms, and he likewise had a supreme disdain for the regular "priests teaching for hire and prophets divining for money" who proclaimed that the Lord was with them and prosperity was just around the corner.

Micah was even more disgusted than Amos with the cities of Judah and Israel. He denounced both the priests and the rich, and

foretold the calamity that would inevitably come to a people behaving in this fashion. But with all his hatred of the rich and his prophesying of disaster, Micah is credited in the sixth chapter of the book of Micah with one of the most eloquent verses in the Old Testament, "What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?"

Isaiah, who came after Amos and lived about the same time as Micah, seems to have been more a city man than a farmer. He came of good family and apparently had easy access to the King. He seems to have been less concerned with the relationship between the poor farmer and the city man than he was with a statesmanlike course for Judah in her relationship to surrounding nations.

He was a statesman, and saw the peril to Judah in foreign alliances. Poor little Judah was in imminent danger of being overrun by

either Egypt or Assyria, or both, and Isaiah, knowing the intense fear of his people, utilized this fear as an opportunity to speak of a greater force than foreign alliances. I can't help feeling that Isaiah knew something of the arts of the politician as well as having the vision of a statesman and the fervor of a prophet. When Hezekiah was building up his alliance against Assyria, he felt from every point of view that he was right when he said, "We are Jehovah's people; in Jehovah alone let us trust."

III

Isaiah seems to have been the first man in recorded history to meditate long and deeply about international relationships. He knew the sordid politics of these countries so well that he could predict the outcome. He was appalled by the futility of it all and proclaimed that it need not be so. And so we

have the first man saying with profound conviction that the day would come when there would be justice between the nations, when the swords would be beaten into plowshares, when the people of the different nations would find it possible to live and worship in comfort because they recognized the just law of Jehovah.

It is interesting to note in the fourth chapter of Micah, which probably did not come from Micah but was borrowed from Isaiah, it is said that these things will come to pass in the last days. But these prophets with a broader vision, in spite of their feeling of the imminent doom which they strove manfully to avert, also had a strong feeling of ultimate salvation. They could see the continuous play and counterplay of light and darkness. They felt that they themselves were part of the force making for righteousness. Hence, we have Isaiah saying, "Behold

my servant whom I uphold; mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth; I have put my spirit upon him: he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles. He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the streets. A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench: he shall bring forth judgment into truth. He shall not fail nor be discouraged, till he have set judgment in the earth: and the isles shall wait for his law."

The ultimate justice and peace as visioned by Isaiah have not yet been realized. But in literally millions of hearts, this vision still endures. The spirit may perhaps be burning feebly. But there are many today who are willing to say almost with the vigor of Isaiah that this thing will eventually and surely come to pass.

Jeremiah, like Isaiah, seems to have been a city man of good family. Apparently he

was sprung from a priestly line, but no man ever denounced the priests and old line prophets as vigorously as Jeremiah. It was in Jeremiah's time that religion was being formalized and ritualized at Jerusalem. Deuteronomy and the other early books of the Bible were being compiled. Doubtless Jeremiah approved of all this up to a certain point, but apparently he was fearful that the spirit would be lost. He was the last prophet before the exile, and he spoke with full vigor, knowing all the while that the nation was doomed. In spite of his denunciation of those in high places, he had friends among the princes and elders who stood by him when the priests and prophets wanted to destroy him.

In Jeremiah's day, both Egypt and Babylon made Judah a battleground, and he had opportunity to see a continuous succession of the deepest human emotions. Probably no

prophet was hammered so continuously by wide changes of circumstances as Jeremiah. At times he was tempted to despair, but even when he felt most weak he returned to his duty and told the truth as he saw it. Finally he came close to the very heart of things, expressing his disgust with written law and saying, "I will put my law in their inward parts, and in their hearts will I write it and I will be their God and they shall be my people."

Reading the prophets causes the problems of our own times to stand out with greater clarity. The essential problem of social justice has changed scarcely at all since the time of Amos, although modern inventions have complicated the details of the problem and confused the issues. The typical farmer on mortgaged land, however, sees things in almost exactly the same way as Amos. He knows the balances have been falsified by

powerful selfish interest and that a terrible day of reckoning is coming to those who have profited at his expense. These men do not come to Washington: very few of them to Chicago. But I have listened to many of them in the middlewest and in the south, and at times the depth of their feeling is almost pathetic. They know little of economics or history or of balances of trade or relationships with other nations. They are as limited and as intense in their outlook as Amos.

Undoubtedly, we also have today men in many cities of the land who, up to a certain point, are counterparts of Isaiah and Jeremiah. They have the intellectual appreciation of certain forces working remorselessly on a world-wide scale. They perceive certain failures of this nation to adjust herself properly to other nations, but their suffering and the suffering of the people have not yet been sufficiently great to enable them to reach the

intensity of insight which characterized Isaiah and Jeremiah.

Of course, the outstanding characteristic of the prophets which is lacking today is that intensity of conviction which enabled them to say, "Thus saith the Lord." Frankly, I see no reason why there should not emerge today men who are the modern equivalents of the prophets of old. It is not surprising while we were conquering this continent that we had so few leaders or spokesmen who in any way resembled the prophets. The problems of social justice previous to 1900 were not complicated in this country. There were plenty of grafters in high places, but their grafting did not press heavily on the people because there was always chance of escape to the free land of the frontier. Today, however, we have the problem of learning to live with each other and with the rest of the world. The United States has not yet worked

out any method for defining justly the relationship between the farmer, the laboring man and the industrialist. The difficulties of making these adjustments are very great because of the lack of understanding on the part of the people, and this lack will not be dispelled until there have been recurring periods of suffering provoking great emotion and desire for understanding. Such periods of stress and strain will undoubtedly bring forward strong men who will attempt to define the issues.

The stage is being set for a social battle astonishingly similar to that which raged in Judah and Israel from the time of Solomon until Judah went into captivity. It must be remembered that when the prophets were actually living, they had no thought that their sayings would eventually become a part of a revered Bible. They were flesh-and-blood men concerned with the affairs of the times.

I trust we shall never have to have a prophet like Elisha who stirred up Jehu to bloody revolution. And in this connection, it is interesting to note that Jehu formed a compact with the Rechabites, the communists of that day, who in their hatred of commercial civilization had returned to the simple life and had vowed under no circumstances to own land.

Yes, I trust that we shall not need Elishas and Jehus and Rechabites to cure the evils of this civilization by causing the blood to flow in the streets. But we will need men who are willing to think more fervently and vigorously than most of our leaders have hitherto. We need thinking equal in vigor to that of the prophets if we are to define with sufficient clearness the issues on which decisions are necessary if this nation is not to wallow helpless in world affairs like a ship without a rudder. The great lesson of the prophets, it

seems to me, is their intensity of conviction that behind the material there is something supremely worth while which guides us in our handling of material things.

II

THE SPIRITUAL ADVENTURE OF THE REFORMERS

II

THE SPIRITUAL ADVENTURE OF THE REFORMERS

THE reformers of the sixteenth century are astonishingly like the prophets who lived twenty-five hundred years earlier. They did not say, "Thus saith the Lord," but they spoke with equal conviction, and it is evident from their actions that such men as John Calvin and John Knox felt just as deeply, and were prepared to suffer just as much, for their convictions as Amos, Isaiah or Jeremiah. Like their earlier prototypes, they were attacking a powerful, entrenched priesthood. Undoubtedly, many of the evils and blessings of our present-day civilization

trace to these men of iron who determined to seek God in their own way, no matter how much trouble they caused easy-going contemporaries.

In these men we find the origin of the rugged individualism which was so highly prized during the Century of Progress. Against the background of their day, the reformers were perhaps as significant as the prophets. But it happens that we have many of the details of the daily life of these men and we know their weaknesses as well as their strong points as human beings. After studying them in an unprejudiced way, no one can deny their tremendous significance. The whole world, including the Catholic Church, is different because of these men.

It takes a long while to get out from under the shadow of a tremendous emotional conflict following suffering and the shedding of blood. Once prejudices are born, people tend

to cherish them long after the need for them has passed away. As an illustration, one of my friends left his home in southern Virginia this spring to come to Washington. A few days ago his father, a Virginia gentleman of the old school, came to Washington and asked his son for a judgment as to the most beautiful piece of architecture around Washington. His son replied, "The Lincoln Memorial." The father meditated over this for a full day and then said to the son's wife, "There are too many Yankees around Washington, my dear. You must see that our boy gets safely back home without too many Northern ideas."

The causes which led to the Civil War were superficial phenomena compared with those which produced the Reformation. The warfare and the shedding of blood which grew out of the Reformation ideas lasted for nearly two hundred years. It is not surpris-

ing, therefore, that this tremendous conflict should cast a shadow which even today obscures the vision of both Protestants and Catholics as they attempt to assess the true character and contribution of the reformers.

II

Before going farther, I think it might be wise for me to give enough of my own religious background so that you can make due allowance for certain prejudices which may appear in this discussion. It happens that I was raised in the United Presbyterian Church and that my grandfather was a United Presbyterian minister. The United Presbyterian ministers were educated men, well grounded in Calvinism, and many of them took delight in occasional sermons against the idolatry of the Papacy. In 1928 I remember a good United Presbyterian and his wife called on me and attempted to demonstrate from the

Book of Revelation that the Roman Church was the Whore of Babylon and that in case Al Smith won the 1928 election, then the last days, in truth, were upon us.*

As a growing boy and young man, I found considerable intellectual exercise and interest in following the severely logical Presbyterian sermons. A little later I began to question many of the points raised by the minister in the course of his sermon. After a time I felt that a critical attitude in the House of God on the Sabbath was not proper, and so I stopped going to church. In college I imbibed the customary doctrines of *laissez-faire* economics and "the survival of the fittest"

* This passage is as it was given in the Alden-Tuthill Lectures before the Chicago Theological Seminary on January 30, 1934. When the author discovered that Round Table Press had made arrangements for syndication he asked that the entire personal reference be omitted. Through an error only the first part was omitted dealing with the early religious background of the author. It is obvious, of course, that the author wishes to emphasize those things which unite humanity rather than those which separate and perpetuate hatred, fear and prejudice.

evolution. Also, one of my college friends interested me in reading some pamphlets by Ralph Waldo Trine, one of which was entitled, *Thoughts Are Things*. Like all young men partially trained in science, I became rather skeptical for a time. More and more I felt the necessity for believing in a God, immanent as well as transcendant. About this time I attended a Roman Catholic service and was greatly impressed by the devotional attitude of all present. I had an instinctive feeling that I, also, would like to *genuflect*, to cross myself, and remain quietly kneeling after the conclusion of the mass, in silent adoration. Some years later I studied, rather superficially, to be sure, the Aristotelian logic as developed by St. Thomas Aquinas, and used by the Jesuits and other neo-scholastic churchmen in support of the present Roman Catholic position.

Unfortunately, I found that intellectual

studies of this sort tended to destroy for me the spiritual beauty of the mass. For some reason the scholastic method of reasoning, as applied to religious matters, has the same effect on me as a closely reasoned Calvinistic sermon. I fear both Presbyterians and Roman Catholics would say that the Lord had hardened my heart. And so it is that I eventually became a member of a so-called high Episcopalian parish which, incidentally, is the most poverty-stricken in my home town. It is fair to tell these things so that you may make allowances as I deal with the men who brought on the Reformation. I have read both Catholic and Protestant books about these men and cannot but feel that all of the biographers are prejudiced witnesses. My testimony may be equally prejudiced but, at any rate, I have given you a certain amount of data so as to put you on guard as to the type of prejudice.

The first thing which stands out in the lives of the reformers of the sixteenth century is their tremendous earnestness. The only people of this century who seem to have a comparable earnestness are such men as Lenin, Mussolini, and Hitler.* No one in the religious world today has an opportunity to exhibit an earnestness comparable with that of Luther, Calvin and Knox. Religion has a totally different kind of significance today from what it had in the sixteenth century. At that time it dominated the political and economic world to an extent beyond present-day comprehension.

From the fourteenth century onward, the

* This sentence is as it was given in the Alden-Tuthill Lectures before the Chicago Theological Seminary on January 30, 1934. When the author learned from Round Table Press that the lectures were to be syndicated in the daily press he asked that the sentence be omitted because recent experience had indicated that unscrupulous commentators have not hesitated to lift sentences out of their context to make it appear that the author's opinions are contrary to those he actually holds. It is suggested that page 127 be read in connection with this sentence.

Popes became interested in collecting increasing sums of money from the ecclesiastical jurisdictions in the different countries. The Church of Rome became more and more a law court with an activity in many ways startlingly like that of Washington today. Job hunters congregated there, and various kinds of people interested in special privileges. Princes and other rulers entered into special deals with Papal authorities. And thus it came to pass that in the early days of the sixteenth century, many of those most eager to become Protestants were those who were chiefly thinking of devising some scheme to get out of paying so much money to Rome. At a time when both the German people and the German princes were becoming increasingly uneasy about money which was being sent to Rome, the Augustinian monk, Luther, who was both a preacher and teacher at the University of Wittenberg,

posted in Latin his famous Ninety-five Theses.

Luther was purely academic in his approach, but the propositions which he stated indicated that he had a grave question as to whether the Roman Church had certain powers which it had been claiming from a commercial point of view during the preceding two hundred years. His propositions do not seem in any way exciting today. Luther at that time was a respectable monk and not a reformer, and he was greatly surprised to see the enormous demand from the German people for his Theses reprinted in the German language.

The Germans knew that Pope Leo X was living in a most extravagant way and they were happy to have an excuse to stop sending him money. The Pope needed the money sorely, and so the scholastic reasoning of Thomas Aquinas was brought out to prove

Luther wrong. Steps taken by the Pope to discipline Luther came to naught because the Elector Frederick was the patron of the University of Wittenberg and was pleased with the sudden fame which Luther brought the University. Moreover, he doubtless felt like most of the other Germans about sending so much money to Rome. At this time Luther was still a good Catholic and willing to write a submissive letter to the Pope. The Roman Curia was not satisfied with the letter. He then began to realize the fundamental point at issue was the supremacy of the Pope. I suppose one of the most dramatic occasions in the last five hundred years came when Martin Luther, guarded by two hundred Wittenberg students, went over to Leipzig to debate with John Eck on the primacy of the Pope. The interest in the debate was enormous. It cleared the air for both Luther and the German people. Without intending it,

he had suddenly become a reformer, and in him focused the desire of the German people to worship God and serve Him in their own way.

Luther became a German patriot and wrote an appeal entitled, *To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation.* In this treatise he struck with terrific power at the claim that there were certain people belonging to the spiritual estate and others belonging to the temporal estate. Luther claimed that shoemakers and tailors could worship God just as well as the Bishops or the Popes. According to Luther, it wasn't necessary to withdraw from the world and go into a monastery in order to worship God. You could do that just as well in your daily work. How strangely modern reads Luther's statement, "It is of much more importance to consider what is necessary for the salvation of the com-

mon people than what St. Francis, or St. Dominic or St. Augustine, or any other man laid down, especially as things have not turned out as they expected." He mentions the way in which pilgrimages interfere with regular honest work and conduce to immorality. He calls attention to the commonly recognized practice of priests living with a woman and having a family but not being able to call their children legitimate.

It would be possible to pick out quotations from Luther which, if we did not know more about his life, would make him appear as a veritable prophet. But when we speak of Luther's sympathy with the common man and with ordinary human nature, we must also remember that Luther's position was such that during a considerable portion of his life he played his hand in close conjunction with the German princes. When the Peas-

ants' War came on, he was decidedly against the peasants. He denounced them in unmeasured terms and said, "Peasants must bear the crack of the whip and the whiz of the bullets; if they refuse to obey, let the cannon balls whistle among them, or they will make things a thousand times worse." Again he said, addressing the German princes, "Dear lords, smite, stab, destroy. . . . Whoever dies fighting for authority is a martyr before God. . . . I pray everyone to depart from the peasants as from the devil himself."

Luther, trained in scholasticism as he was, felt it necessary in throwing off the yoke of Rome to bring into being a new intellectual yoke of equal validity. He believed in identifying the prince with the Church, while at the same time, the Church itself refrained from mixing in politics. The temporal

ruler, to a considerable extent, replaced the Pope as a sort of religious authority. Concerning such sects as the Zwinglians or Anabaptists, Luther had feelings which were almost as strong as toward the Papists. He felt so sure of his insight that he thought that those who did not believe his doctrine were sure to be damned. His earnestness of conviction is such that he deserves to rank with the prophets of the Old Testament. Unfortunately, we do not have enough information concerning the daily life of the prophets of the Old Testament to know whether or not they suffered from the same human traits as Luther.

It is also interesting to speculate as to the extent to which the German people's response today to a central authority may be due to Luther's attitude toward the peasants and toward the temporal authority of his time.

III

Calvin, with his weak body, his keen mind, his extraordinary will-power and his political facility, was in some respects a veritable Isaiah. He was merciless to his own body and to the bodies of others. In his youth, Calvin had apparently been greatly taken with the Catholic form of worship, but when he reacted against it he resolutely put out of his life the things which have to do with beauty and emotion. The Roman Church was such a formidable enemy that he believed everything should be done as much as possible in the opposite way. He did not have sufficient bodily vitality to care a great deal about getting married himself, yet he believed it was the duty of the clergy to marry because the Roman priests did not marry. Writing a letter to his closest friend in Geneva about getting married himself, he

said, "I am not of that passionate race of lovers who, when once captivated with the external form, embrace also the moral defects it may cover. The only beauty which can please me must be that of a woman who is chaste, agreeable, modest, frugal, patient, and affords me some hope that she will be solicitous for my personal health and prosperity." In this coldly calculating spirit, he married a widow of whom he eventually became very fond, although his will-power and devotion to public duty were of such a type that he kept an appointment the evening she was dying. His final tribute to her was that she had never in any way interfered with his work.

In the city of Geneva, Calvin, by the sheer strength of his will-power and logic, was able to set up a theocracy of a type which has never been seen before or since. Multitudes of personal habits were punishable by law. Geneva

was a town of only about fifteen thousand people, but in four years, forty-eight Genevans were executed and seventy-six banished. In one year there were four hundred and fourteen prosecutions for such crimes as singing, wearing the wrong kind of clothes, eating fish on Good Friday, arguing against putting men to death for religious opinions, saying there is no devil or hell, and the like. The Consistory, which was essentially a church body, drew up the regulatory standards.

The chief objective, of course, was to compel church attendance and to make sure that the church members behaved themselves according to Calvin's standards. Snooping informers abounded and the whole theocracy can be made to sound like an extremely sorry mess to people of our day. Calvin himself was not by nature bloodthirsty, but he believed so strongly that the glorification of

God required certain things that he was only too willing to see certain people who disagreed with him executed. The greatest blot on Calvin's career, of course, is the execution of Servetus.

Servetus, like Calvin, was a Protestant who believed that the Pope was the Antichrist but, in addition, he was a rather unusual scientist. He had discovered the fact of the pulmonary circulation of the blood nearly a century before William Harvey and had published a geography in which he had the temerity to deny that Palestine was a land flowing with milk and honey. He believed in God immanent rather than transcendent and rejected predestination and the efficacy of infant baptism. He claimed the prophets, in their statements, were thinking more about the situation around them at the moment than they were in foretelling events in the distant future.

Such ideas made him anathema to both Calvin and the Roman Church. Both determined to kill him. When Servetus fell into the hands of the Inquisition the evidence consisted in part of material which Calvin furnished unwillingly and indirectly (so some say) to the Catholic authorities. When Servetus escaped from France after being sentenced to the flames and was on his way to Italy through Switzerland, he fell into the hands of the Consistory, and Calvin wrote to a friend, "I hope the judgment will be capital in any event, but I desire cruelty of punishment withheld." To show how thoroughly Calvin was the creature of his age, it is interesting to note his comment on Servetus when he was accused of sinning against the Holy Spirit by suggesting that Palestine was not a land flowing with milk and honey. Said Calvin, "The villainous cur only wiped his muzzle and said there was nothing bad about this."

When Servetus was finally burned, Calvin's conscience hurt him because he was a humane man, but the essential thing was the destruction of the heretic. Any powerful intellect which questioned the logical edifice which Calvin had built merited destruction because Calvin felt that he himself had been predestined to carry out the Lord's will.

Actually, of course, Calvin was not as barbarous as the Servetus incident and the Geneva sumptuary legislation would suggest. Making allowance for the spirit of the age, we cannot but reach the conclusion that his earnestness entitles him to be ranked almost with the minor prophets. He preached incessantly the doctrine of the disciplined daily life. All men are equally obligated to do the Lord's work and every man can do it in his own particular vocation. Each man must prove by his actions day after day that he is serving the Lord. The way to glorify

God and enjoy him forever is to work hard day after day on this earth. Moreover, if you work hard enough you will not be bothered with sexual temptation. The churches were to be plain and the clothes, food and houses simple. This doctrine crystallized and imposed on the common people proved to be the most powerful economic weapon the world has ever seen. These nations equipped with a modicum of Calvinistic philosophy inevitably forged ahead. Common people began more and more to think that the saving of money was essentially the same kind of thing as being good for the hope of a heavenly reward.

IV

John Wesley more than a hundred years ago perceived the essential nature of this dilemma when he said in one of his sermons, "I fear whenever riches have increased, the

essence of religion has decreased in the same proportion. Therefore, I do not see how it is possible, in the nature of things, for any revival of true religion to continue long. For religion must necessarily produce both industry and frugality, and these cannot but produce riches. But, as riches increase, so will pride, anger and love of the world in all its branches." Wesley's solution was to exhort the brethren to gain as much as possible and then glorify God by giving abundantly.

John Knox of Scotland more definitely felt himself to be a prophet than either Calvin or Luther. He was a close student of the more violent parts of the Old Testament and inasmuch as he suffered on various occasions from queens in England and Scotland he spoke from time to time about Jezebel. When Mary Tudor was ruling England and Mary of Guise was ruling Scotland and Knox was an exile from home, he wrote out of the

indignation of his heart a blast against the monstrous government of women, saying, "I am assured that it is more than a monster in nature that a woman shall reign and have empire over man. . . . Cursed Jezebel of England with the pestilent and detestable generation of Papists, make no little brag and boast that they have triumphed not only against Wyatt, but also against all such as have enterprised against them or their proceedings. I fear not to say that the day of vengeance, which shall apprehend that horrible monster Jezebel of England, is already appointed in the counsel of the Eternal."

When Mary of England died and Elizabeth came to the throne, John Knox immediately wanted to come to England, where, under Edward VI, he had been active in the Anglican Church, but it happened that Elizabeth, though a Protestant, was also a woman and she looked on the Knox document as

traitorous. Because of the fact that it was published in Geneva, she let Calvin know about it. He thereupon became exceedingly annoyed with what he called the thoughtless arrogance of one individual. Knox was thinking about his own feelings relative to the British and Scotch situation and not giving a thought to the peril he was causing French Protestants. One of these, a minister, wrote to Calvin in regard to the Knox statement, "Women are unworthy to reign; Christians may protect themselves by arms against tyrants," as follows: "I fear that Knox may fill all Scotland with his madness. He is said to have a boon companion at Geneva, whom we hear that the people at Dieppe have called to be their minister. If he be infected with such opinions, for Christ's sake pray that he be not sent; or if he has already departed, warn the Dieppe people to beware of him."

Knox, like Luther, hated the Anabaptists fully as much as the Papists. They had a tendency toward pacifism and socialism together with a belief in the natural goodness of man and of nature. They did not believe it necessary to rely on the Scriptures as the sole objective source of religious inspiration. Doubtless you and I would much prefer associating with Anabaptists to Knox and Calvin but I am Calvinistic enough to believe that it may have been a part of divine Providence to permit Calvinism to triumph because it had in it more driving power to conquer the New World rapidly than would have been the case with a gentler, more humane faith.

Of all the reformers, Knox seems to have been the most violent. He refers to an Anabaptist adversary as a liar, a blasphemer and a devil incarnate. Calvin furnished John Knox with many of his intellectual weapons but not with his extraordinary capacity for

emotional fury. When he returned to Scotland, he preached against the idolatry of the Papists and nowhere in all Europe were the statues of Christ, the Virgin and the Saints more completely destroyed. The Scottish mobs felt that only by destroying the symbol of the Papacy could they destroy the affection of the people for a ritual in which they had once had faith.

Most of the looting of the monasteries or abbeys took place within a year or two after Knox returned to Scotland from the Continent. Catholicism was banished from the land and the death penalty was placed on attendance at mass after the third offense. Mary, the Queen, however, was a Catholic, and when she attended mass in her private chapel, Knox made some remark about Jezebel or the Antichrist or about one mass being more fearful to him than ten thousand armed men.

But, barbarous as John Knox undoubtedly was in many particulars, he nevertheless served to give the Scotchmen the character they have today. He was far more decisively on the side of the common man than Luther. More than any other reformer of his day, he believed that the church and the schoolhouse went hand in hand and many of his ideas, which seemed wild at the time, had a rather striking fulfilment a century or two later. His vigor was so overwhelming that he transformed one of the most miserably mismanaged countries of Europe into one which eventually became one of the most law-abiding and orderly. But Knox also unleashed other forces, as witness Froude, the historian, who credits him with responsibility for the "Adam Smiths with their political economies, and steam engines, and railroads, and philosophical institutions and all the other blessed and unblessed fruits of liberty."

Undoubtedly, the Scotch are better critics, scientists and economists than they would have been without Knox. Probably they are better statesmen and businessmen, but equally probably they are poorer in all that goes to make for appreciation of the beautiful and enjoyment of a rich and abundant life. Unfortunately, many of the Scotch gained from Knox a facility in denunciatory prophecy which makes them somewhat uncomfortable as relatives and neighbors.

The one thing which stands out in the Reformation period is the extreme seriousness with which both the Catholics and Protestants took their religion. The great reformers genuinely thought they were fighting the priests of Baal and did not hesitate to make plans which resulted in the spilling of more blood by far than the slaughterings of Elijah and Elisha when they so enthusiastically sought to destroy the prophets of Baal.

Personally, I cannot help thinking that the Baal religion of the commercial centers of Palestine served an excellent purpose in forcing the great prophets to define their ideas about fundamental human and divine issues much more clearly than would otherwise have been the case. In like manner, it was a splendid thing that the Catholic Church of the sixteenth century was an exceedingly powerful institution. With all its luxury and superficial decay, it was still held together by the Aristotelian logic of the schoolmen and the conviction on the part of millions of sincere people that this logic proved beyond all doubt the validity of Papal authority as the only representative of God here on earth.

To battle entrenched authority of this sort the reformers rationalized their inner certainty of righteousness by erecting a formidable logic based on the infallibility of the

Bible. The battle of the prophets resulted in visions of a profoundly moving character having to do with the eventual triumph of the Lord of Peace. The battle of the reformers brought no such vision but it did result in the generation of tremendous material power which expressed itself first in the creation of democratic institutions and secondly in science and the production of great capitalistic wealth. This, in my opinion, was a necessary step toward the attainment of the vision of the prophets. We are now ready for another step; the impetus of the reformers of the sixteenth century has failed us. The Century of Progress has turned to ashes in our mouths. Is it possible that the world is finally ready for the realization of the teachings of Jesus, the appreciation of the Sermon on the Mount, the bringing of the kingdom of heaven to earth?

III

THE GREAT SPIRITUAL ADVENTURE OF OUR AGE

III

THE GREAT SPIRITUAL ADVENTURE OF OUR AGE

As is the case with thousands of others, I have had the feeling for some years of the possibility of great spiritual changes in the United States which would be of lasting significance not only to this country, but to the whole world as well. But, like everyone else, I find it exceedingly difficult to embody these feelings in definite words. Last week, with this idea running strongly in my subconscious mind, I happened to be in the Department of State and asked for the pamphlet describing the Great Seal of the United States. You are all familiar with the obverse

side of the Great Seal with the American eagle grasping in its left claw thirteen arrows, in its right claw an olive branch with thirteen leaves, on its breast a shield with thirteen bars and above the eagle thirteen stars accompanied by the inscription "E Pluribus Unum." The idea of unity in diversity has truly run through our national life like a prophetic thread.

Familiar as you all doubtless are with the obverse side of the Great Seal, I will venture to say that not many of you are equally familiar with the reverse side where is contained, it seems to me, a most striking refutation of the idea that the founders of the American republic were largely under the influence of such sentimental, godless French rationalists as Rousseau. On this reverse side of the Great Seal we first see an uncompleted pyramid with thirteen courses of stone laid and above it, separated by some little dis-

tance, the apex or capstone with the all-seeing eye, surrounded by what the heraldic designer of 152 years ago was pleased to call a "glory."

Above the apex stone is the Latin inscription "Annuit Cœptis," written under the base of the pyramid are the Latin words "Novus Ordo Seclorum." We might translate the first two words to mean "He hath prospered our beginning" and the others, the "new order of the ages," as signifying the objectives of the completed structure. The Lord had prospered the thirteen states in their beginning, and they were designed to grow. While this inscription originally recorded an expectancy that guided the founders of this nation, for our present generation it is also an encouragement to even broader potentialities. This Great Seal was adopted by the Congress of the United States on June 20, 1782. Those who are devout believers in the prophecies of the Bible and who also have great depth

of feeling concerning the founding and destiny of this country might ask, "Did the designer of the reverse side of the Great Seal have in mind in the words 'Novus Ordo Seclorum' the vision of Isaiah, when he foresaw the day of the Great Peace when all the nations would flow to the mountain of the Lord, or, in other words, the second coming of the Messiah?"

It would be easy for loyal Democrats to say, of course, that "Novus Ordo" is merely Latin for New Deal and that we are now rapidly in process of completing in approved fashion the structure of the American commonwealth as begun by the Founding Fathers. Frankly, while I am well aware of the religious fervor with which the New Deal has been launched, and while I can see in it potentialities which may eventually make it worthy of the prophecy of the reverse side of the Great Seal, it will take a more definite

recognition of the Grand Architect of the Universe before the apex stone is finally fitted into place and this nation in the full strength of its power is in position to assume leadership among the nations in inaugurating "the new order of the ages."

Until recently this generation has been all too immersed in the greed of capitalism, the spiritual sloth of ever-increasing material pleasures and the humanistic agnosticism of men who drew their inspiration from the superficial scientists and economists of the nineteenth century. If materialistic counsel prevails, I fear that this nation may, some time during this generation, definitely reject the apex stone which would otherwise enable us to stand in a position of the most glorious leadership any nation has ever enjoyed. If we reject the stone, I have no doubt that in due process of time it will pass to some other nation. This world was meant to be one

world, and while it is proper that there should be the greatest diversity in unity yet there is a spiritual fellowship which means something so definite in terms of the brotherhood of man that it must of necessity be expressed to some extent in outward form. Catholic and Mason alike recognize the validity of the saying, "Except the Lord build the house, their labor is but lost that built it."

No great religion, whether it be Christianity, Judaism, Buddhism, Hinduism or Mohammedanism, can recognize ideals which set up a particular race or class as an object of religious worship. While admittedly there has been but little true Christianity in the world during the past five hundred years, yet it would seem that a follower of Christ least of all should recognize nationalism as the commander of his spiritual self. From the standpoint of true religion, it is singularly unfortunate that so many of the faiths,

churches and doctrines are confined by national boundaries and, therefore, take on national colorings. Any religion which recognizes above all the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man must of necessity have grave questionings concerning those national enterprises where the deepest spiritual fervor is evoked for purely nationalistic, race or class ends.

In saying this, I am quite willing to admit that the great religions of the world have for the most part abdicated during the past fifty years, and perhaps even for much longer than that. Certain outward forms were maintained, vast sums of money were given, churches were built, rituals were observed, alms were distributed, ethical principles were inculcated, but the heart of religion which has to do with faith in the values of a higher world, with the cultivated joy of the inner life which comes from the

Holy Spirit, both immanent and transcendent, was lacking.

II

Moreover, in spite of the tremendous increase in material things resulting from the stimulus to the human spirit growing out of the Protestant revolt, no truly fruitful effort had been made to bring the kingdom of heaven to earth in terms of social justice. Into the vacuum created by this failure stepped those who claim that service to a particular nation, class or system is sufficient to command the highest spiritual aspirations of man.

I am inclined to agree with Tawney and Weber that capitalism is a rather natural outgrowth of Protestantism; and I would go farther in saying that socialism, communism and fascism are in turn rather natural developments from capitalism. Spiritually, they

are all much alike. Capitalism has commanded, and even today commands, a material type of religious fervor which is as unreasonable, dogmatic and theoretical as any long-established theology.

The faith of business men in rugged individualism, in profits unlimited and in the divine right of big business to call on government for help in case of need, while at the same time government was to stay out of business under all other conditions, represented views so firmly held as to be beyond mere logic and in the realm of the transcendental. At one time, it was a part of the business man's creed to believe in the ten-hour day. More recently some of them with equal fervor have come to believe in the thirty-hour week. A Pennsylvania Congressman, who has on his factory payroll several hundred men, told me recently almost with an air of religious conviction that the way to stop un-

employment was to put such a tax on all forms of improved machinery that we would all be forced to go back to more primitive ways of doing things.

His solution for the farm problem was to put such a tax on tractors and other improved agricultural machinery that farmers would be forced to depend almost exclusively on animal and hand labor. With all the fervor of our Protestant forefathers, he preached the doctrine of the simple life with regular, long, hard hours of work with simple tools. He wanted to turn back the hands of time, to encourage frugality and thrift and to bring about the accumulation of capital without encouraging the investment of that capital in the improved methods which he felt had been our nemesis.

This man's attitude, which doubtless represents that of millions, has in it some real truth but, of course, it is as theoretical and

visionary in many respects as the view of the most unworldly professor or minister of the gospel. Many business men in the depths of their religious fervor have created new devils and new symbols. They hurl the word "chiseler" with terrible jagged force at anyone who disagrees with them. Anyone who points out that unduly high profits serve to unbalance productive power and consumptive power and that, therefore, the government, so far as it influences profits through codes and agreements, of necessity has a real interest in the way in which profits may react on the stability of the industry under consideration as well as the national welfare—is likely to be called a Red with the greatest intensity of conviction, as though the devil himself were being spoken of.

I have listened to business men talk about the "red devils" in my own department and I know their intensity and understand the ex-

tent to which their analysis departs from the reasonable into the field of an emotional obscurantism, semi-religious in nature. There are certain things which business men hold sacred which center around the profit motive and which they look on as axiomatic and not to be questioned under pain of financial death and, in the old days, under pain of political death and social ostracism.

I could say many complimentary things about the "religion" of business men, about their natural goodness of heart, the long hours and intensity with which they labor, the fortitude of the smaller business men under impossibly trying conditions and the generosity of many of the larger business men when they have made great profits.

Under a machine civilization producing goods for transportation over wide areas of land and operating under a monetary system based largely on the debt-credit mechanism,

the unrestricted profit motive brings on an anarchy terrible to behold. Business men themselves are now more or less recognizing this and are striving desperately to perfect certain curbs which will enable them to go back again to the good old times.

All of this is not surprising when we remember what a short distance we are from the pioneer frontiersman whose economic philosophy was all too often, "While you are gettin', git a plenty."

I wonder if the masterful intellect of Calvin would be more proud or sorry if he could come back to earth today and look over the history of the past three hundred years and see the way in which the great spiritual power of his doctrine had been used to give a hardy pioneer race the strength with which to exploit such vast natural resources in so brief a time, to see the way in which the business men, bred of this race, had nerved themselves

for iron-willed competition with size of profits measuring the degree of success.

III

I am afraid that Calvin would be forced to conclude that the soul of Protestantism had left the Church and gone into capitalism and that there it had become distorted by strange theories from the field of economics and biology. Searching for intensity of belief, Calvin might find it among capitalists, fascists or communists, all of whom are his spiritual descendants. Seeing all of this, Calvin would doubtless not weep but would observe, "Lord, thou hast foreordained all of this for the enhancement of thine ultimate glory."

The truly dismaying thing, of course, is the lukewarmness, the wishy-washy goody-goodiness, the infantile irrelevancy of the Church itself. Millions of people still bring

joy to their individual souls by attending a church service. I know that there are millions of Catholics and high church Episcopalians alone who obtain extraordinary comfort from the celebration in due form of the Holy Eucharist, the very thing which John Knox felt was more dangerous than ten thousand armed men. Millions of other church-going people find rest for their souls in attending church service, but here all too often there tends to arise a disputatious attitude concerning ethical matters discussed in the sermon and more appropriate to a week-day lecture course than to a Sabbath worship in the House of God.

You are all acquainted with fine, cultured, tolerant people who reserve their sharp practices and grabbing tendencies for the hard life of the business world and who are delightful and enjoyable companions in the social life of evenings and holidays. They

yearn for a more satisfactory business existence, but do not know exactly how to bring it to pass. Most of them, unless they are only two or three generations removed from saintly ancestors, are decidedly materialistic and skeptical about the existence of God or a future life. They want their children to go to Sunday school and learn the Ten Commandments and the salient facts of the Bible, but they themselves are convinced of the fundamental truth of evolution, the struggle for existence and *laissez-faire*, dog-eat-dog economics. They know that they have to "get" if they are not to be "gotten" and, while they don't like this kind of business any better than you or I, they don't know of anything practical to do about it. Therefore, the most decent of the well educated materialists accept some form of "Lippmannesque" humanism as the way of making the best of a bad job.

Now, humanists are, as a rule, superficially agnostic yet resolutely practice the good life as they see it and do their best to bring that life to pass for other people as well. Many of them derive considerable pleasure from making fun of the sacred superstitions of the preceding generation and are doubtless a healthful influence in many ways because they puncture the hypocritical pretensions of people who dully profess "religion" and sharply practice business. In ordinary every-day life, humanists are interesting, amusing, stimulating and humble. People of this sort will always be very useful in keeping "religious" people from taking themselves prematurely seriously.

The religion of the future must affirm in unmistakable terms the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man not merely by way of giving a mystical glow to the individual worshiper, but also by way of bring-

ing about the kingdom of heaven on earth. The Church of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries sought to bring this about in a very definite way by theocracy, by a way of life where economic activity was subordinate to a religious consciousness. Over large areas of Europe, tremendous efforts were made to fix just prices, fair wages, right conditions of labor, all with the idea of building a social state fit to glorify God.

During this period, Europe searched its mind and heart as never before or since. Some of the manifestations of that search were embodied in beautiful cathedrals. The great effort of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries failed, I suppose, because the attempt was made to cramp the human spirit unduly in defiance of certain growth principles. Certain classes were probably treated unjustly but it is rather astonishing that a degree of moderate equilibrium could have been held

for so long in view of the lack of knowledge of modern science and economics.

Today we have an opportunity to repeat on a more vast and more just scale what was attempted in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The physical tools for this social experimenting are already at hand. We now have vast systems of statistics dealing with prices and quantities and labor costs and ratios between productive power and consumptive power. We have record-keeping machines which enable us to do the bookkeeping of a continent in case such a thing seems to be desirable. We have scientific and economic insight into certain relationships extending over the whole world which no people ever had before.

IV

Because of this, it is easily possible to construct the machinery of a New Deal, provided the people really want it and are

willing to experiment continually in the invention of new parts for the social machine in the same spirit as a mechanic invents new parts in the perfecting of an automobile model. In the invention of mechanical machinery, the engineers do not immediately get mad and call people names in case something doesn't pan out quite as they expected. They try again and after a while they get somewhere. If we approach the shaping of the New Deal in this frame of mind, I am sure we can bring our social machinery, after a time, up to date with modern science and modern methods of mass production. The chief difficulty is with human hearts and human wills.

It will require quite a little change in the temper and education of the American people before they are willing to settle down resolutely, steadfastly and continuously to the job of making such changes in social machinery

as they find necessary after a process of trial and error. At the present time, they are so suspicious of each other, so certain that the other fellow is chiseling at their expense that we in Washington tend all too easily to gain the impression that the people of the United States are packs of ravening wolves determined to drag each other down. Of course, when you get away from Washington and the larger cities you lose this feeling very rapidly.

I am certain that if we are to continue with modern science and the application of methods of mass production, we must also continue with the perfecting of social machinery so as to balance in a just way our consumptive ability with our productive efforts. I am sure this can be done in a way to give us twice as much of the material things of life as we had in 1929. But I am also sure that if the spirit of man continues to

become narrower and more bitter we can easily be forced into terrible disaster far beyond the worst that we saw in 1932.

To avoid this disaster requires in my opinion a definite change in the hearts of men. I am not discussing human ethics but the attitude toward those immaterial, intangible, unknowable forces which, by faith, we believe make for righteousness and which we customarily call God. It seems to me that the time is almost here when we can say that from the hard-headed material point of view the Sermon on the Mount is practical, provided our hearts are truly permeated with the doctrine of Jesus and our minds are capable of formulating social machines corresponding in their precision with our mechanical machines.

Our control over nature is such that if the profit motive and the monetary system did not interfere unduly it would be easily possible

to remove from all humanity those great fears having to do with lack of food, lack of shelter, lack of employment, trouble in case of sickness and destitution in old age. It is a blot on American social civilization that these fears have not yet been removed. I know the situation in Washington well enough so that I feel the leaders there would be the first to agree with me that their efforts in this direction are merely crude beginnings. They feel the necessity for something well thought out that will work in the long run, that will dignify the most humble laboring men and give them an opportunity to feel that they are a definite part of the scheme of things and not mere hangers-on.

There are those in Washington who feel that the way out is toward decentralization. They like the idea of small factories out in the open country, with the workers in those factories living on small farms. They like

the idea of fewer automobiles and more horses. They want more people on the land and fewer people in the cities. They want to see us get back to the mode of life we enjoyed in the eighties, claiming that there is a spiritual enrichment which comes from a more continuous contact with the simple affairs of daily life, on the soil or in the small factory. These people would like to frame laws to break up the large corporations so that there would be no nation-wide distribution system.

While I have great sympathy with these people in many respects, and while there is a chance they may be proved to be right, nevertheless I feel definitely that it is our destiny to go ahead first with the larger concept which involves even more science and a greater control over nature than that which we now enjoy. I feel that one of our great lacks is courage and desire, commensurate in

their magnitude with our scientific understanding. In the twelfth chapter of Ecclesiastes, you remember that passage which reads:

"Also when they shall be afraid of that which is high, and fears shall be in the way, and the almond tree shall flourish, and the grasshopper shall be a burden, and desire shall fail."

The old-fashioned people who like to interpret the Scriptures literally might say, in case they lived in the Dakotas or Minnesota, that these words were truly prophetic because undoubtedly the grasshopper has been a serious burden on these regions in recent years. The thing which gives me a feeling of poetic sadness, however, is the reference to the failure of desire. When men are so whipped that they are dulled and sodden, that they have no possibility of desire or fervor, then indeed civilization is drawing to its close and

the dust is preparing to return to the earth as it was, and the spirit to God who gave it.

V

With the facts as I see them today, the American people should prepare to step forward boldly and confidently. It is true that we can have a very high standard of living if we develop a spirit and economic policy of intense nationalism such as has been followed by certain foreign countries. In such case, our importance in the world and to the world will be no greater than those countries. Spiritually, we shall have been defeated indeed and shall have accepted a pagan nationalism as our God.

I well recognize the terrific complexities, both psychological and economic, if we are to step forth resolutely into world affairs at the present time. It may be impossible politically, and I claim no expertness in that field.

But from the religious point of view, I feel confident that we must expand our vision to embrace the far-off countries and must take steps to adjust our economic affairs so that we are benefiting the far-off countries at the same time that we are benefiting the rank and file of our own people.

These things undoubtedly can be done. They are economically and politically possible if our hearts are right. Of course, it may be that in the process of doing these things it will be advisable to decentralize our great corporations and to have less transportation of goods rather than more. I question this, but have an open mind.

In any event, the world is now ripe for a type of religion which is truly catholic in the original sense of the term. I wish that in some way it might be so universal as to embrace Buddhists, Mohammedans, Jews and Protestants, as well as the so-called Catholics.

It should be possible for the people in all of these religions to have a fellow feeling for those who strive for the good life in the other religions. Perhaps we can accept from the humanists enough toleration to give a greater catholicity of approach.

But, in addition to recognizing the honest seekers by whatever path they come, it is also essential to remember the need for tremendous earnestness. Earnestness of the depth I have in mind can come only from such a contact with inner and outer reality that it produces a state of mind which can say in all honesty, "Thus saith the Lord." Or in more modern language, "The whole current of righteous events is in this direction. Decision is undeferrable. If we decide wrongly, the time of great tribulation will come upon us."

The world is one world. We have our Amoses crying aloud over the injustices of the

social system but we need in addition our Isaiahs who perceive that the Lord is Lord of all the earth and that the application of spiritual power to a system of nationalistic or class enterprises is a negation of true religion. A modern Isaiah, seeing the possibilities of modern transportation and communication and observing the national barriers imposed by the nations against each other since the war, would cry out against international injustices. He would go to the people of the different nations with his message and call for a New Deal among nations. He would do this with vigor and immense earnestness even though from an immediate practical point of view his message might be premature.

If the Protestant reformers were living today, they would be striving not against the Catholic Church nor the Protestant Church, but against capitalism, communism, fascism

or some other system challenging in its power. Lenin in his attack on capitalism proceeded with a logic not unlike that of Calvin. He was conditioned by capitalism in the same way that Calvin was conditioned by Catholicism. He is one of the few men of this century whose earnestness deserves to rank with that of Amos or John Knox. He suffered, meditated, thought and acted. However much we may dislike such men, we must respect their power to transform society in line with their vision.

I am convinced that we are approaching the time of establishing spiritual allegiances on a much broader base than hitherto. There are genuine seekers in all of the great religions, believing in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, in the transcendental, mystical importance of all that this means in terms of other worldliness, while

at the same time they believe in the fundamental necessity of embodying these inner-perceptions in terms of the machinery of the outward world. Each religion has been so defaced by the materialists and those fundamentalists who hold strictly to dry, literal, logistic, textual interpretations that there are few earnest seekers hungry not only for the inner truth but for seeing that inner truth given tangible manifestation in terms of the machinery of human relationships.

These people should be cherished; their hands should be strengthened. I have met some of them in nearly all of the Christian and many other faiths. They cut across churches and faiths just as they cut across nations. They are men of good will and inner-perception. They long for the coming of the kingdom of heaven and they believe in its imminence. They worship God, the Holy

Ghost and the Christ spirit under many different names. It is my faith that the origin and destiny of this country have more in common with this ultimate catholicity of world religious purpose than most of us have yet been willing to admit. This is the only safe kind of nationalism I know for the United States.

VI

To formulate in both intellectual and heart-compelling terms the creed that will command the allegiance of the members of the true catholic church or corporate body of Christ, whatever the nominal names may be, is the duty of the prophets of this age. The stage is set for their passionate thunderings, their intense longings, their visions of ultimate purposes. They can usher in a millennium—the "Novus Ordo Seclorum"—or they can consign us, because of our unbelief

and hardness of heart, into a captivity of long years of suffering.

This will immediately raise in your minds questionings as to the part of existing religious organizations in serving as channels to nourish and express the prophetic spirit. I realize that religious organizations have a certain usefulness in perpetuating vital traditions even though they may resemble shells, and I recognize in some of these shells out of the past a lovely odor of sanctity before which I personally can bow in real reverence, yet I also know that there are many of this generation who are repelled by the names and forms of the past and who at the same time have a genuine reverence for the life within. Modern science, economics and psychology have caused them to have a profound distrust of the Aristotelian scholastic reasoning of the Roman Catholic Church on the one hand and the fundamentalist literal holding fast to the

Scriptures of the stricter Protestants on the other hand. They know of the intolerance, cruelty and bigotry displayed in previous centuries by these two groups and they would lay down their lives to prevent any revival of such narrowness whether it be in the name of the Lord or the name of the devil.

Some generations ago, both the Protestant and Catholic churches were very hesitant to recognize scientific truths which are now of necessity accepted everywhere. Is there no universal solvent by means of which genuinely devout and intelligent Catholics, genuinely devout and intelligent Protestants, sincere and earnest humanists and all other well-wishers of the richer life can feel kindly toward each other within certain bonds of the spirit?

Most of us are of necessity practicing a kind of dualism. I find myself, for instance, in the company of scientists using the

terminology of scientists and laughing unconsciously when certain fun is poked at the musty fustiness of the religionists. In the company of economists, striving to define clearly the forces that make for social balance, I find myself falling into their particular terminology and becoming very skeptical about forms of religious life which are merely personal and which permit certain saints to enjoy the luxury of religious ecstasy without having any effect on eliminating the injustices inherent in the social system which supports them. In the company of journalists, I find it easy to skate over the surface of things with a sophisticated terminology which nevertheless is very effective in pricking the hypocrisies of those who take themselves too seriously.

Must those of us who believe there is something profoundly significant in religious life hold that as something altogether separate

and apart from the life in the world of practical affairs or cannot some unity, some broader catholicity be introduced?

The ultimate reality, I am convinced, is much more in line with what the prophets saw and with what Jesus saw than most of the humanists would care to admit. There is continuous danger that economic organizations, political organizations, church organizations and scientific organizations, in structure, language and thought will tend to obscure these realities. There is just as much danger of superstition and orthodoxy in the scientific and economic world as in the world of religion. There is always danger that the bright young men who from generation to generation work for a new deal will forget that the science and economics on which their faith is oftentimes based is perhaps to some extent out of date.

I suppose the thing which I am arguing

for fundamentally and eventually is a continuous, fluid, open-minded approach to reality, which at the same time is deadly in earnest. I cannot but feel that the destiny of the world is toward a far greater unity than that which we now enjoy, and that in order to attain such unity it will be necessary for the members of the different races, classes and creeds to open their hearts and minds to the unfolding reality of the immediate future in a way which they have never done before. The stress and strain of the next twenty years are going to be peculiarly favorable to such an awakening. Men will undoubtedly arise who can make the issues vital and real. I feel it is impossible to clarify the issues further until such time as the pressure of events have further sharpened our inner vision.

IV

STATESMANSHIP AND RELIGION

IV

STATESMANSHIP AND RELIGION

THE problem of statesmanship is to mold a policy leading toward a higher state for humanity, and to stick by that policy and make it seem desirable to the people in spite of short-time political pressure to the contrary. True statesmanship and true religion therefore have much in common. Both are beset by those, who, professing to be able politicians and hard-headed men of affairs, are actually so exclusively interested in the events of the immediate future or the welfare of a small class that from the broader, long-time point of view they are thoroughly impractical and theoretical.

Isaiah, Jeremiah and Micah were truly great statesmen. They caught the vision of a superior social state and with all the fire at their command held up that vision before the people in spite of the protests of those concerned with politics, priestly intrigue, and commercial gain.

The prophets failed in that their statesmanship was not adopted, but their efforts were so striking that the record remains to this day as an incentive to those who desire to look beneath the surface.

Religion to my mind is the most practical thing in the world. In so saying I am not talking about church-going, or charity, or any of the other outward manifestations of what is popularly called religion. By religion I mean the force which governs the attitude of men in their inmost hearts toward God and toward their fellowmen.

Jesus dealing with that force said, "Thou

shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and all thy strength and all thy soul and all thy mind. Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

The Catholic Church dealing with this force said in effect that the minds and hearts of men are best attuned to God and humanity through the continual celebration in due form of the mass by specially ordained priests whose duty it is also to receive and distribute alms.

Martin Luther and John Calvin dealing with this force said each man can meet his God face to face without priestly intercessor —each man can worship God most effectively by working hard in his chosen calling every minute of every day except the Sabbath.

The Reformation in action contracted rather than expanded the doctrine of Jesus; nevertheless the extraordinary emphasis on the individual unleashed forces which

enabled man through energetic self-discipline to conquer a new continent in record-breaking time, to develop an unprecedented control over nature, and to develop capitalism as a temporary mechanism for social control.

The classical economists of a hundred years ago in their highly individualistic, *laissez-faire* doctrine expressed in non-emotional terms the economic essence of Protestantism. Spencer, Darwin, Huxley, and their followers in promulgating the doctrine of natural selection and the survival of the fittest gave the whole idea an apparent foundation in nature. As a result Protestantism, which in its origin was highly spiritual, became in fact more and more material. Many of the ministers fought against the trend, but the children of the best families in their congregations for two generations or more have gone to college and accepted as gospel truth

laissez-faire economics and "survival of the fittest" biology. Trimmings have been put on this foundation but most of the children of our leading families have accepted as a matter of course an attitude toward the universe and toward their fellow man which is based on pseudo-economics, pseudo-science, and pseudo-religion.

Today I am glad to say that economics, science and religion are all re-examining the facts under pressure from the common man who is appalled by the tragic nonsense of misery and want in the midst of tremendous world stocks of essential raw materials. Science has given us control over nature far beyond the wildest imaginings of our grandfathers. But unfortunately the religious attitude which produced such keen scientists and aggressive business men makes it impossible for us to live with the balanced

abundance which is now ours as soon as we are willing to accept it with clean, understanding hearts.

To enter the kingdom of heaven brought to earth and expressed in terms of rich material life it will be necessary to have a reformation even greater than that of Luther and Calvin. I am deeply concerned in this because I know that the social machines set up by the present administration will break down unless they are inspired by men who in their hearts catch a larger vision than the hard driving profit motives of the past. More than that, the men in the street must change their attitude concerning the nature of man and the nature of human society. They must develop the capacity to envision a co-operative objective and be willing to pay the price to attain it. They must have the intelligence and the will power to turn down

simple solutions appealing to the short-time motives of a particular class.

II

Enduring social transformation is impossible of realization without changed human hearts. The classical economists, most orthodox scientists and the majority of practical business men question whether human nature can be changed. I think it can be changed because it has been changed many times in the past. The Christians of the second and third centuries inaugurated a tremendous change. Again, the Protestants of the sixteenth century introduced an element of firm resolution, and of continuous daily discipline into human nature which had hitherto been lacking. Great religious movements which consist essentially of a changed human nature eventually come to fruition and are followed

by a time when a spiritual vacuum coincides with great material uncertainty. The people in their anguish then seek to change their course. They admit the errors of their past ways and turn toward the potentialities of a brighter future. In such a time, the truly religious, in the broadest sense of the term, have an opportunity to plant seeds, some of which will flower almost at once and others of which will not produce fruit for a century or two.

What a marvelous opportunity there is today to minister to the disillusioned ones who at one time had such perfect faith in endless mechanical progress, in the continual rise of land values in their own particular sections, in the possibilities of ever-expanding profits, and in wages which were to go higher and higher while the hours of work per week became less and less. This faith in triumphant machinery as the last word in human

wisdom has now been rudely shaken. The ideal of material progress could satisfy only so long as we were engaged in the material job of conquering a continent.

Of course, those of us who are close to the scientists and inventors realize that extraordinary progress is yet possible. As a matter of fact, the possibilities along this line are almost infinite, but the significant thing is that we cannot enter into these possibilities until we have acquired a new faith, a faith which is based on a richer concept of the potentialities of human nature than that of the economists, scientists and business men of the nineteenth century.

What an extraordinary twist of the human mind it was in the nineteenth century to think of human society as composed of so-called "economic men"! As a result of this thought an increasing percentage of our population did become in fact "economic automatons."

The profit motive ruled and it was discovered that, through the mechanism of money and the organized commodity and stock exchanges, it was possible to make huge profits in an atmosphere so theoretical and divorced from reality that mistakes in judgment, involving millions of innocent victims, became all too easy.

It is possible for powerful men in positions of financial influence or in control of certain fundamental mechanical processes to pose as hard-headed men of affairs when as a matter of fact they have all too often created temporary illusions; they have been merely blowing bubbles. By the manipulation of money, the floating of bonds, they have distorted the judgment of our people concerning the true state of future demand and future supply. Oftentimes with excellent motives and looking on themselves as realists, they were in

fact sleight-of-hand performers and short-change artists.

Yes, we have all sinned in one way or another and we are all sick and sore at heart as we look at the misery of so many millions of people, including among them many of our close friends and relatives; and we ask again and again why this should be so in a nation so blest with great resources, with nearly half the world's gold, with great factories, with fertile soil and no embarrassing external debt. We look at all this and ask what mainspring inside of us is broken, and where can we get a new mainspring to drive us forward.

I am wondering if the religion we shall need during the next hundred years will not have much more in common with the Christianity of the second and third centuries or possibly even with that of the Middle Ages

than with the Protestantism of the past hundred years. The strong personal initiative conferred by the Protestant religions must in some way be merged into a powerful religious attitude concerning the entire social structure.

I am not talking about welfare drives and other forms of charity which good men among the Protestants, Jews and Catholics alike support so loyally. The thing I am talking about goes far deeper. It is an attitude that will flow not from external compulsion but that will spring from the hearts of the people because of an overwhelming realization of a community of purpose. Perhaps the times will have to be even more difficult than they have been during the past two years before the hearts of our people will have been moved sufficiently so they will be willing to join together in a modern adaptation of the theocracy of old.

III

Neither socialism nor communism meets the realities of human nature as I sense them. Both of them have an emotional dryness, a dogmatic thinness which repels me. They deal in the dry bones of the "economic man" and I crave in addition the flesh, and blood and spirit of the religious and the artistic man.

I want to see whole realms of being kept out of the sphere of economics and business. The economic and business machine should be subjected more and more to the religious, the artistic and the deeper scientific needs of man. The business man prompted all too often by short-time profit motives has had altogether too much influence; or possibly I should say that his ideals have caused the nation to put entirely too high a percentage of its energy into efforts which were

bound to be self-defeating and eventually productive of unemployment and misery.

It is proper that we should respect the business man in his true sphere. He should be encouraged to develop a social machinery which will make it possible to bring about an equilibrium from year to year between productive power and consumptive power. He should be encouraged to work out social machinery to bring about as nearly as possible a just distribution of our physical output to the different individuals of the nation. For rendering his technical services, the business man should, like all the other elements of the population, be assured of a fair salary and a modest return on capital, combined with such assurances of security as may be possible in view of the resources and productive power of the nation.

The bitterness in the hearts of many of the communists and farm strikers in this coun-

try appalls me, but I am even more concerned about the way in which powerful business interests, steeped in the doctrines of *laissez-faire* and survival of the fittest, are able to hire fine intelligent men to serve short-time selfish ends by presenting their case in Washington. The expressions of the extreme left-wingers may oftentimes be venomously cruel and brutal but I am thinking even more about the intelligent burrowing of those whose thoughts are guided chiefly by concern for immediate profit. Of course, our hope lies in the fact that the great bulk of laboring men, farmers and business men are neither bitter nor rapacious. They are patient, long-suffering people, slowly struggling to find the light.

If the Christian religion is to help them in finding that light, it must furnish the spiritually hungry people with something which is truer and more compelling than the

"dog-eat-dog" philosophy of the classical economists and the biological scientists. I am not denying either evolution or the law of supply and demand. But I am denying the right of a philosophy based on such laws to guide humanity toward the infinite richness which is resident on the one hand in human nature itself and on the other hand in the capacity of science to exploit the material world for our benefit. Business men operating as individuals on the animal plane can destroy us no matter how great our scientific discoveries. And, as a matter of fact, the greater the discoveries the more certain the destruction.

We are approaching in the world today one of the most dramatic moments in history. Will we allow catastrophe to overtake us, and as a result force us to retire to a more simple, peasant-like form of existence? Or will we meet the challenge and expand our

hearts, so that we are fitted to wield with safety the power which is ours almost for the asking? From the standpoint of transportation and communication, the world is more nearly one world than ever before. From the standpoint of tariff walls, nationalistic strivings, and the like, the nations of the world are more separated today than ever before. Week by week the tension is increasing to an unbelievable degree. Here reside both danger and opportunity.

The religious keynote, the economic keynote, the scientific keynote of the new age must be the overwhelming realization that mankind now has such mental and spiritual powers and such control over nature that the doctrine of the struggle for existence is definitely outmoded and replaced by the higher law of cooperation. When cooperation becomes a living reality in the spiritual sense of the term, when we have defined

certain broad objectives which we all want to attain, when we can feel the significance of the forces at work not merely in our own lives, not merely in our own class, not merely in our own nation, but in the world as a whole—then the vision of Isaiah and the insight of Christ will be on their way toward realization.

IV

The spiritual cooperation to which I refer depends for its strength on a revival of deep religious feeling on the part of the individual in terms of the intellectual concept that the world is in very truth one world, that human nature is such that all men can look on each other as brothers, that the potentialities of nature and science are so far-reaching as to remove many of the ancient limitations. This concept which now seems cloudy and vague to practical people must be more than the re-

ligious experience of the literary mystic. It must grow side by side with a new social discipline. Never has there been such a glorious chance to develop this feeling, this discipline, as in this country today.

Let me illustrate from the immediate dilemma which confronts this nation: shall we follow the path of nationalism, or the path of internationalism, or some combination of the two, or let things drift? Each of the first three paths carries with it great benefits and great penalties. Nationalism means an extraordinary degree of internal regulation, especially in agriculture. Internationalism means planning of foreign loans, lowering of tariffs and a planned retirement of certain types of industry. To carry out either one or a combination of the two sufficiently well to prevent great misery means widespread debate in Congress and among the people until the national will has been aroused

sufficiently to make it possible for the people to hold resolutely to a sensible plan in spite of the handicaps which go with it.

Until the tariffs are lowered we are forced in agriculture to follow in some measure the plan of nationalism. Frankly, I don't like it, but there is no alternative for the time being. It may, of course, have invaluable results if a high degree of social discipline is developed. Already there are signs that our wheat acreage reduction plan is developing some of this social discipline.

The national quota is split up among the states and then among the counties and individuals. There is the hard problem of wrestling with the stubborn individual facts to meet a social outcome. Some of the newer Kansas counties claimed the right to grow more wheat than we thought they should. We had to re-examine our facts; the farmers had to re-examine theirs. There have been

literally hundreds of thousands of individual debates, many of them conducted on a very low plane, but all the time I believe there has come an increasing appreciation of both the international and the national problem in terms of the local welfare. In another year the problem will have shifted but I trust there will still be a machinery for voluntary social discipline.

We must have more and more of this kind of thing throughout our entire national life. If the international plan instead of the national plan is eventually decided upon we shall still need a social discipline, though of a somewhat different type. In any event every individual in the country should feel that he is necessary to carrying out the plan. He should feel that the plan is necessarily a shifting one but that the shifts are to be made in terms of the total welfare and not as the result of pressure from a particular region or

class. He should feel that the national plan is to be fitted into the welfare of the world as rapidly as can be done with safety.

The social discipline can be given a very definite machinery, but after all the really important thing is the spirit pervading the whole effort. If men close to the inward realities are able to grasp the present national and world picture with their minds they can make the necessary social discipline seem tremendously worth while. Without such men the discipline will prove sterile and we shall drift on a sea of sophisticated materialism toward not only national disaster but world catastrophe.

We need a "heart trust"—a trust in the innate goodness of the human heart when it has not been warped by the mammon worship, the false science, and the false economics of the nineteenth century. Shibboleths have too long enabled our brains to

use a false logic to restrain that which the human heart would do. Yes, we need a "heart trust" even more than we need a "brain trust." But perhaps intelligence can help remove some of the fetters from the human heart. And perhaps the human heart can direct and kindle the human brain.

V

We know that the attitudes of men can change almost in the twinkling of an eye and that the change is oftentimes permanent. We know that the attitude of Luther, Calvin, and Wesley was communicated to millions of people and that interacting with the *laissez-faire* doctrines of the Manchester school of economics and the Darwinian doctrine of the survival of the fittest, it unleashed the forces responsible for our modern civilization, in both its material grandeur and its present collapse.

Luther and Calvin doubtless acted appropriately to the abuses of their days. They have furnished untold millions with the spiritual strength necessary to meet the adversities of the rapidly changing economic world. But today the problem has shifted. We are no longer faced with the problems of material scarcity. It no longer suffices, therefore, to strengthen the spiritual powers of the individual with the simple doctrine of the Psalms of David. The time has come now for the striking of a more universal note. This is especially necessary from the world point of view because never before have the different nations been so moved to act as separate national entities. It is time to hold aloft a compelling ideal which will appeal to all nations alike. I am sure that all of the noble religions of the world have in them a teaching of this sort. In the Christian religion you will find it in the Sermon on the

Mount, and in some of the sayings of Isaiah and Micah. It is time for the religious teachers to search for these broader teachings. They are dealing with forces even more powerful than the scientists or the economists. When they have a fiery yet clear understanding of this, they will, by working on the human heart, so balance the message of the economist and the scientist that we will yet be saved from ruin.

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01000 9316